


The Office Action proposes that Pohjakallio discloses the above-mentioned feature of claim 1 in Fig. 3 and column 5, lines 29-57 (see Office Action page 2, last four lines). However, Pohjakallio does not disclose terminating a communication link. Thus, it necessarily follows that Pohjakallio cannot disclose the claimed relationship between the timing of terminating a link for information currently transmitted and requesting the establishment of a link for transmitting next information. As a result, Pohjakallio does not identically disclose the invention defined by claim 1.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Pohjakallio does not anticipate the subject matter defined by claim 1. Independent claim 7 similarly recites the above-mentioned feature distinguishing apparatus claim 1 from the applied references, but with respect to a method. Therefore, the rejections applied to claims 2-5 are obviated and allowance of claims 1 and 7 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Date: February 26, 2008
JEL/DWW/att

Attorney Docket No. 009289-04161
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1901 L Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 659-6963
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559